



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,628	01/16/2002	Anders Lundh	8194-587	6466
27045	7590	05/31/2005	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/050,628	LUNDH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1024 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 10-11, 15-16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McVey et al.[U.S. 5479477].

4. As to claim 1, McVey teaches the invention as claimed including: a method of accessing descriptive information associated with a TDMA/GSM switch [e.g., col.3, lines 52-64; 103, Fig.1] having an adjunct processor 123, Fig.1], the method comprising:

incorporating at least a portion of a database of descriptive information [119, Fig. 1; col.4, lines 3-16, wherein system resource features is part of the descriptive information] with data provided to the adjunct processor to control the TDMA/GSM switch;

accessing the adjunct processor to access the TDMA/GSM switch [col.4, lines 17-46]; and

accessing the adjunct processor to access the portion of the database of descriptive information incorporated with the data provided to the adjunct processor [col.4, line 47 – col.5, line25].

5. As to claim 2, McVey teaches that the method further comprising selecting the portion of the database incorporated with the data provided to the adjunct processor based on the data provided to the adjunct processor to control the TDMA/GSM switch [col.1, lines 46 – 54; col.5, lines 11-25].

6. As to claims 10-11, 15-16 and 24, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-2, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-9, 12-14 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McVey et al.(hereafter "McVey")[U.S. 5479477], as applied to claims 1-2, 10-11, 15-16 and 24 above.

9. As to claim 3, McVey does not specifically teach the portion of the database comprises selected ones of a plurality of ALEXserv databases.

However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that McVey's system is adaptable to including different databases, including selected ones of a plurality of ALEXserv databases that are deemed necessary to control its relevant communication resources such as TDMA system, because McVey teaches that the control terminal is a database can be loaded via input device such as keyboard and therefore the system is not restricted to any particular database type [col.5, lines 43-67].

10. As to claim 4, McVey further teaches that upon loading the database two tables of information are provided for assignment of communication resources to control modules (i.e., via first and second associations) and [col.5, lines 43 – 67; col.6, line 63 – col.7, line 3; 203, 205, Fig.2].

McVey does not specifically teach further details about selecting a first database associated with central function commands; and selecting a second database associated with base station and switch commands associated with the TDMA/GSM switch.

However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that McVey's first and second associations could be further improved by storing all the possible associations in two separate databases and uses relevant commands for the selection because such approach would simplify and facilitate McVey's associations process.

11. As to claim 5, McVey further teaches that accessing the adjunct processor to access the TDMA/GSM switch and accessing the adjunct processor to access the portion of the database of descriptive information incorporated with the data provided to the adjunct processor are carried out in a single window terminal [101, Fig. 1; i.e., the same terminal is used for both accessing the database and the TDMA switches residing in the data router of Fig. 1].

12. As to claim 6, McVey does not specifically teach that accessing the adjunct processor to access the portion of the database of descriptive information incorporated with the data provided to the adjunct processor comprise accessing the portion of the database of descriptive information utilizing command line commands.

However, using command line commands for interacting with a computer program or database is well known in the art. For example, system running under the conventional operating systems (e.g. DOS or UNIX) usually uses command line commands for human-computer interactions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that McVey's system may use command line commands for the above access because it is a design choice depending on the application program and the operating system itself.

13. As to claim 7, McVey does not specifically teach the command line commands comprise at least one of a code description command and/or a print description command. However, it is well known to form the command line commands as either code description command or print description command.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that McVey's control terminal may adopt either form for command description because this is simply a design choice.

14. As to claim 8, McVey does not specifically teach that accessing the adjunct processor to access the portion of the database of descriptive information incorporated with the data provided to the adjunct processor comprises accessing the portion of the database of descriptive information utilizing a graphic user interface.

However, using GUI for interaction with a computer is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that McVey's control terminal may utilize a GUI for human interaction because GUI is known to be more user-friendly than the command line approach.

15. As to claim 9, McVey does not specifically teach that the TDMA/GSM switch comprises a GSM switch.

However, since GSM is a well-known European standard, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to also include GSM switches in McVey's system because by doing so McVey's system could also be utilized in Europe.

16. As to claims 12-14 and 17-23, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-11 and 15, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-11 and 15 above.

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Beckmann et al. [U.S. 5659604];

Boyle et al. [U.S. 6421324]; and

Senn et al. [U.S. 6704563].

18. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

May 20, 2005


5/20/05